

A conceptual understanding of vishishTa-vaishishTya-avagAhi-jnAna

A clear understanding of vishishTa-vaishishTya-avagAhi-jnAna is instrumental in understanding of sAkshi-bhAsyatva of bhAvarUpa-ajnAna because ajnAna-pratyaksha is accepted to be vishishTa-vaishishTya-avagAhi-jnAna. Let us understand the siddhAnta in simple terms step-by-step in accordance with Advaita Siddhi and Laghu Chandrika as explained by BALabOdhinI.

Let A = visheshya, B = visheshaNa-1, C = visheshaNa-2 present in B

vaishishTya = vishishTa-tva

The jnAna of C-vishishTa-B is a vishishTa-jnAna. Further, the vishishTa-tva (vaishishTyam) of this vishishTa-vastu i.e. C-vishishTa-B shines in A. That is to say, the vaishishTyam of vishishTa-vastu shines in visheshya. So, the jnAna of C-vishishTa-B-vishishTa-A is called a vishishTa-vaishishTya-avagAhi-jnAna (VVAJ).

B is visheshaNa of A. Thus, B has visheshaNatA. The avachchhedaka of visheshaNatA is C. So, C is visheshaNatA-avachchhedaka. Visheshanata-avachchhedaka-prakAraka-jnAna (VAPJ) is defined to be the jnAna of C-vishishTa-B.

Let us have the jnAna “दण्डी पुरुषः”. Here, A = purusha, B = danDa, C = danDatva.

So, VVAJ = the jnAna “दण्डी पुरुषः”, VAPJ = the jnAna “danDatva-vishishTa-danDa”.

In siddhAnta, the claim of the NyAya that - vishishTa-jnAna is born out of visheshaNa-jnAna and that prior visheshaNa-jnAna is a prerequisite for vishishTa-jnAna - is not accepted. The siddhAnta adduces the example of abhAva-jnAna as a vishishTa-jnAna to support its claim. In response, the opponent says that abhAva-jnAna is not a vishishTa-jnAna but a VVAJ. Thus, though abhAva-jnAna does not have visheshaNa-jnAna-janyatva, yet it has VAPJ-janyatva. The opponent says VVAJ is VAPJ-janya. Let us study the objection and rebuttal.

Objection: You accept that ajnAna-pratyaksha is vishishTa-vaishishTya-vishayaka i.e. ajnAna-pratyaksha is VVAJ. This is so because ajnAna-pratyaksha in visheshya-Atman is always along with the perception of visheshaNa of ajnAna namely jnAna-virOdhitva and sa-vishayakatva. Without being with vishaya or without having jnAna-virOdhitva, there is no perception of ajnAna. ajnAna-qualified-with-these-two-visheshaNa appears in Atman. Therefore, (ज्ञानविरोधित्व-सविषयकत्व-विशिष्ट-अज्ञान)-विशिष्ट-आत्मनः प्रत्यक्षम् एव अज्ञानस्य प्रत्यक्षम्. Therefore, विशिष्टस्य-अज्ञानस्य वैशिष्ट्यम् आत्मनि भासते. अतो अज्ञानस्य प्रत्यक्षं विशिष्ट-वैशिष्ट्य-विषयकमेव. Therefore,

ajnAna-pratyaksha is VVAJ. In ajnAna-pratyaksha, AtmA is the visheshya and ajnAna is the visheshaNā. Now, ajnAna has visheshaNā. The visheshNā-avachchhedaka are jnAna-virOdhitva and sa-vishayakatva. Thus, before VVAJ i.e. ajnAna-pratyaksha, you need to have VAPJ i.e. the jnAna of savishayakatva-vishishTa-ajnAna and jnAna-virOdhitva-vishishTa-ajnAna. This would, in turn, require the jnAna of vishaya. Now if jnAna of vishaya is present, ajnAna cannot be present. And thus, the contradiction would remain.

Answer: There is no pramANa that VAPJ has kAraNā towards VVAJ.

The claim of pUrvapakshI is that without VAPJ, there cannot arise VVAJ such as “danDI purushah”. Because, first we know danDatva-vishishTa-danDa and then only danDa-vishishTa-purusha-jnAna can arise.

Similarly, pUrvapakshI says, like दण्डी पुरुषः, we have अहम् अज्ञः. Here, AtmA is akin to purusha and ajnAna is like danDa. And like danDatva, there are savishayakatva and jnAna-virOdhitva. Therefore, before VVAJ, i.e. before the knowledge अहम् अज्ञः, we need to have VAPJ i.e. we need to know savishayakatva-vishishTa-ajnAna and jnAna-virOdhitva-vishishTa-ajnAna. And ajnAna-vishaya having been known, there would no longer remain ajnAna. Thus, contradiction remains in bhAvarUpa-ajnAna paksha, so claims pUrvapakshI.

SiddhAntI explains - This very idea that VVAJ is kArya and preceding VAPJ is kAraNā is untenable as there is no pramANa therefor. Let the knowledge “दण्डी पुरुषः” be kArya, fine, but the kAryatA-avachchhedaka is simply pratyaksha-tva and not VVAJ-tva. And the kAraNā-avachchhedaka is not VAPJ-tva, rather indriya-sannikrishTa-tva. When such a simple already accepted (क्लृप्त) kArya-kAraNā-bhAva is available, what is the need to accept a new kAryatA-avachchhedaka and kAraNā-avachchhedaka.

Similarly, in case of knowledge वह्निमान् पर्वतः, the kAryatA-avachchhedaka is anumiti-tva and not VVAJ-tva. Similarly, kAraNā-avachchhedaka is vyApti-jnAna-tva and not VAPJ-tva.

Similarly, for upamiti-jnAna and shAbda-jnAna.

The crux of the matter is - the kArya-kAraNā-bhAva can be explained by क्लृप्त-कार्य-कारण-भाव only, which is accepted by one and all and there is no need to imagine new avachchhedakAs for kAryatA and kAraNā.

Objection: If we accept different kAryatA-avachchhedaka and kAraNatA-avachchhedaka for the four VVAJ such as pratyaksha-jnAna, anumiti-jnAna, upamiti-jnAna and shAbda-jnAna, then how can we justify the definite feeling of VVAJ-tva which arises in all the four jnAnAs?

Answer: See, blue-rUpa originates from different material, pot originates from different material. Thus, the kAryatA-avachchhedaka of blue-rUpa and pot are blue-ness and pot-ness respectively. Yet, when they combine, then their combined form is enough to give rise to a specific buddhi, namely नीलघटत्व, blue-pot-ness. There is no need to search for a different kAryatA-avachchhedaka. The combined form of separate kAryatA-avachchhedaka is enough to give rise to singular buddhi. Similarly, दण्डी पुरुषः has pratyakshatva as kAryatA-avachchhedaka, वह्निमान् पर्वतः has anumititva as kAryatA-avachchhedaka. But, seen together, they appear to have VVAJ-tva. There is no need to say that VVAJ-tva is some separate kAryatA-avachchhedaka. It just arises like blue-pot-ness on account of the combination of pratyakshatva and anumititva. Advaita Siddhi, p. 1137, says - विशिष्टवैशिष्ट्यबुद्धित्वेन विशेषणतावच्छेदकप्रकारकज्ञानत्वेन च कार्यकारणभावे मानाभावात् , प्रत्यक्षत्वादिरूपेण पृथक् पृथक् क्लृप्तकार्यकारणभावेनैवोपपत्तेः विशिष्टवैशिष्ट्यबुद्धित्वस्यार्थसमाजसिद्धत्वात्.

So far the siddhAntI has outrightly denied that VAPJ has any kAraNatA towards VVAJ. And hence the objection against the ajnAna-pratyaksha “अहम् अज्ञः” does not hold good.

ALTERNATIVELY

However, now, as an alternative, the siddhAntI explains that the objection against ajnAna-pratyaksha is not valid **even if we accept** that VAPJ has kAraNatA towards VVAJ.

Even if we accept for the time being that VAPJ-tva is the kAraNatA-avachchhedaka and VVAJ-tva is the kAryatA-avachchhedaka, still there are some situations where VAPJ is not possible at all. There, the opponent also holds the VVAJ to arise as follows - “First visheshaNa-jnAna in visheshya AND then visheshaNAntara-jnAna in visheshaNa”. So, let the same logic be applied in all cases. Let ajnAna-pratyaksha also have VVAJ-tva through “First visheshaNa-jnAna in visheshya AND then visheshaNAntara-jnAna in visheshaNa”. And then, the objection would be untenable.

For example, let us take - रक्तदण्ड-वान् चैत्रः. Here, Chaitra is visheshya and danDa or रक्तदण्ड is the visheshaNa. The visheshaNatA-avachchhedaka is red-ness. Now, this knowledge रक्तदण्ड-वान् चैत्रः is VVAJ.

This knowledge can certainly sometimes be preceded by a definite VAPJ in the form of रक्तत्व-विशिष्ट-दण्ड-ज्ञान. However, sometimes it may not be preceded by VAPJ. Let there be a doubt in the form of “दण्डो रक्तो न वा, whether the stick is red or not”. So, one has the doubt as to whether the stick is

red or not. Therefore, there is no रक्तत्व-विशिष्ट-दण्ड jnAna. Thus, there is no VAPJ but the jnAna immediately before the jnAna रक्तदण्ड-वान् चैत्रः is a samshaya-jnAna. Still, it is seen that even in such cases, the jnAna in the form of रक्तदण्ड-वान् चैत्रः does arise through the mechanism of 'विशेष्ये विशेषणं तत्र च विशेषणान्तरम्'. That is to say, one first knows that Chaitra has a stick and then subsequently comes to know that the stick is red. Now this knowledge has the same vishaya as that of VVAJ i.e. knowledge which is preceded by VAPJ. Since in the doubt-case, there is no VAPJ, one may not say that it is VVAJ, but the fact remains that the knowledge रक्तदण्ड-वान् चैत्रः arising after a doubt “दण्डो रक्तो न वा” has the same AkAra as that of VVAJ. And since it has the same AkAra as that of VVAJ, what is the harm in holding the knowledge-arising-after-a-doubt also as VVAJ. That is why Advaita Siddhi, p. 1137, holds that VVAJ can arise even through the mechanism of 'विशेष्ये विशेषणं तत्र च विशेषणान्तरम्'.

इह च सामग्रीतुल्यत्वेन 'विशेष्ये विशेषणं तत्र च विशेषणान्तर'मिति न्यायेन विशिष्टवैशिष्ट्यज्ञानसंभवात् ।

BAlabOdhinI clarifies it beautifully in p. 1140 - “रक्तदण्डवान् पुरुष” इति विशिष्टवैशिष्ट्य-अवगाहि-बोधे “दण्डो रक्तो न वा” एदादृश-संशयोत्तरं रक्तत्व-प्रकारक-निश्चय-अभावात् विशिष्टवैशिष्ट्य-अवगाहि-बोधो न भवितुमर्हति। किन्तु “दण्डो रक्तो न वा” इति संशयोत्तरम्-अपि 'विशेष्ये विशेषणं तत्र च विशेषणान्तरम्' इति रीत्या विशिष्टवैशिष्ट्य-अवगाहि-बोध-समान-आकार-बोधो जायत एव। विशिष्टवैशिष्ट्य-अवगाहि-बोध-समान-आकार-बोधो अपि विशिष्टवैशिष्ट्य-अवगाहि इति उच्यते।

Similarly, in case of अहम् अज्ञः, first there will be visheshya-AtmA-jnAna, then the visheshaNa-jnAna i.e. perception of ajnAna, and then the visheshaNa of ajnAna, such as savishayakatva and jnAna-virOdhitva, are perceived. Hence, there is no contradiction in the bhAvarUpatva of ajnAna by it being the vishaya of a vishishTa-vaishishTya-avagAhi-jnAna.

So far is how it is explained in Advaita Siddhi. However, **LaghuchandrikA** explains this VVAJ a step further. LaghuchandrikA posits a rule as to when can VAPJ be required for VVAJ and when is VAPJ not required for VVAJ.

The crux of the explanation by LaghuchandrikA is as under.

Let A be the visheshya, B be the visheshaNa-1 located in A. Let C be the visheshaNa-2 located in B. It is clear that C is the visheshaNatA-avachchhedaka as far as dharmI-B is concerned. LaghuchandrikA says that if there is a C1 as the visheshaNatA-avachchhedaka and there is C2 as dharmitA-avachchhedaka, then VAPJ is required for VVAJ. So, it brings in the concept of dharmitA-avachchhedaka and holds that if a dharmitA-avachchhedaka in addition to visheshaNatA-avachchhedaka is present, then VAPJ is needed for VVAJ. And if there is no

dharmitA-avachchhedaka in addition to visheshaNatA-avachchhedaka, then VAPJ is not required and VVAJ can arise through ‘विशेष्ये विशेषणं तत्र च विशेषणान्तरम्’.

For example, let us take a VVAJ in the form of knowledge “घटवत् भूतलम्”. Here, A = bhUtala, B = ghaTa, C = ghaTa-tva. In this VVAJ, visheshaNatA-avachchhedaka is ghaTatva. There is no other dharmitA-avachchhedaka-dharma shining here in addition to visheshaNatA-avachchhedaka-dharma i.e. ghaTatva. Hence, such VVAJ does not require VAPJ in the form of knowledge “ghaTatva-vishishTa-ghaTa”.

However, in the case of VVAJ “रक्तदण्डवान् पुरुष”, A = purusha, B = danDa, C = rakta-tva. Here, the visheshaNatA-avachchhedaka-dharma is rakta-tva. But, in addition thereto, a dharmitA-avachchhedaka-dharma viz. danDatva is shining in the dharmI danDa. Therefore, the dharmitA-avachchhedaka-dharma of raktatva-dharma in raktatva-vishishTa-danDa is danDatva, which is different from raktatva. Hence, in such a situation, VAPJ is required for VVAJ.

BAlabOdhinI explains at p. 1141 - यस्मिन् धर्मिणि विशेषणता-अवच्छेदक-धर्मो भासते, तत्र धर्मिणि यदि अन्यो धर्मो धर्मिता-अवच्छेदक-रूपेण भासते, तदा (विशिष्ट-वैशिष्ट्य-अवगाहि-ज्ञाने) विशेषणता-अवच्छेदक-प्रकारक-निश्चयः अपेक्षते। यदि धर्मिणि धर्मिता-अवच्छेदक-रूपेण कश्चन धर्मो न भासते तत्र विशेषणता-अवच्छेदक-प्रकारक-निश्चयो न अपेक्षते।

घटवत् इति प्रतीतौ विशेषणता-अवच्छेदक-घटत्व-धर्मस्य धर्मो घटः। अस्मिन् धर्मिणि विशेषणता-अवच्छेदक-घटत्व-धर्म-व्यतिरेकेण अन्यो धर्मः धर्मिता-अवच्छेदक-तया न भासते, अतः अत्र विशेषणता-अवच्छेदक-प्रकारक-निश्चयस्य अपेक्षा नास्ति। किन्तु रक्तदण्डवान् इति विशिष्ट-वैशिष्ट्य-अवगाहि-बुद्धौ विशेषणता-अवच्छेदक-धर्मो रक्तत्वम्, रक्तत्व-धर्मस्य धर्मो दण्डः। विशेषणता-अवच्छेदक-रक्तत्व-धर्म-व्यतिरेकेण दण्डत्व-धर्मः रक्तत्व-धर्मस्य धर्मिता-अवच्छेदक-रूपेण भासते। अतः अत्र विशेषणता-अवच्छेदक-प्रकारक-निश्चयः अपि अपेक्षते।

Now in case of the impugned VVAJ, in ajnAna-pratyaksha, the two visheshaNa of ajnAna namely jnAna-virOdhitva and savishayakatva are both visheshaNatA-avachchhedaka. Neither is the dharmitA-avachchhedaka of the other. That is to say, jnAna-virOdhitva is not the dharmitA-avachchhedaka of savishayakatva. Nor is savishayakatva the dharmitA-avachchhedaka of jnAna-virOdhitva. These two visheshaNa of ajnAna are perceived as एकत्र द्वयम् like दण्डी कुण्डली चैत्रः. [एकत्र द्वयम् happens when there is simultaneous perception of more than one visheshaNa. In the case of sequential perception, such as in rakta-danDa, एकत्र द्वयम् is not possible]. It is not that one dharma is visheshaNatA-avachchhedaka and the other is dharmitA-avachchhedaka. Rather, both dharmAs are visheshaNatA-avachchhedaka. And there is no dharmitA-avachchhedaka in ajnAna-pratyaksha at all. Just as in the case of दण्डी कुण्डली चैत्रः, both danDa and kunDala appear as equivalent visheshaNa, both the dharmAs namely jnAna-virOdhitva and savishayakatva appear as equivalent

visheshaNatA-avachchhedaka. There is no rule that dharmitA-avachchhedaka must be perceived. While in case of rakta-danDa-vAn-Chaitrah, danDatva appeared as dharmitA-avachchhedaka in raktatva-vishishTa-danDa, in the case of savishayakatva-vishishTa-ajnAna, jnAna-virOdhitva does not appear as dharmitA-avachchhedaka NOR in the case of jnAna-virOdhitva-vishishTa-ajnAna, savishayakatva appears as dharmitA-avachchhedaka. Rather, both savishayakatva and jnAna-virOdhitva appear as visheshaNatA-avachchhedaka only without any dharmitA-avachchhedaka at all.

This being so, in VVAJ ajnAna-pratyaksha in the form of अहम् अज्ञः, there is no dharmitA-avachchhedaka in addition to visheshaNatA-avachchhedaka. And hence, as per the rule, VAPJ is not required for VVAJ. And hence, the objection by the opponent, which was based on the prior requirement of VAPJ, is untenable.

BAlabOdhinI explains in p. 1142 - एवम्-एव विषय-विशेषित-अज्ञानस्य विशिष्टवैशिष्ट्यावगाहि-प्रतीतौ विशेषणता-अवच्छेदक-प्रकारक-निश्चयस्य-अपेक्षा नास्ति । विषय-विशेषित-अज्ञानस्य प्रत्यक्षे ज्ञानविरोधित्व-सविषयकत्व-धर्मद्वय-विशिष्ट अज्ञानस्य वैशिष्ट्यं (आत्मनि) भासते । अस्यां प्रतीतौ ज्ञानविरोधित्वं सविषयकत्वं च धर्मद्वयं विशेषणता-अवच्छेदक-रूपेण-एव भासते । एतयो-धर्मयो-मध्ये एकस्य धर्मस्य अपरधर्म-धर्मिता-अवच्छेदकरूपेण न भानम् । ज्ञानविरोधित्वविशिष्टेऽज्ञाने धर्मिणि सविषयकत्वरूपो धर्मो विशेषणता-अवच्छेदकरूपेण न भासते । एवं सविषयकत्वविशिष्टेऽज्ञाने धर्मिणि ज्ञानविरोधित्वधर्मो विशेषणता-अवच्छेदकतया न भासते । प्रदर्शितयोर्धर्मयोः एको विशेषणता-अवच्छेदकतया अपरस्तु धर्मिता-अवच्छेदकतया न भासते । किन्तु धर्मद्वयं तुल्यवत्-एव एकत्र द्वयम् इति रीत्या वा खले कपोतन्यायेन वा एकस्मिन्-अज्ञाने धर्मिणि विशेषणता-अवच्छेदकरूपेण भासते । यथा दण्डी कुण्डली वासस्वी चैत्र इति प्रतीतौ चैत्ररूपे धर्मिणि दण्डकुण्डलादीनि विशेषणानि युगपत् तुल्यरूपेणैव भासन्ते; किन्तु दण्डविशिष्टे चैत्रे कुण्डलं विशेषणं न भवति, एवमेव ज्ञानविरोधित्व-सविषयकत्व-धर्मद्वयम् अज्ञानरूपे धर्मिणि युगपद्-विशेषणता-अवच्छेदकरूपेण भासते । एकस्मिन् धर्मिणि एकाधिकविशेषणस्य युगपद्-भाने एकत्र द्वयम् इति रीत्या प्रतीतिः जायते । किन्तु विशेषणानां क्रमिकसम्बन्धबोधे तत् न भवति । एवमेव ज्ञानविरोधित्वं सविषयकत्वं च धर्मद्वयमज्ञाने धर्मिणि युगपद्भासते । किन्तु एक विशेषणविशिष्टेऽपरं विशेषणतया न भासते । एक विशेषणविशिष्टेऽपरस्य विशेषणतया भाने प्राग्विशेषणत्वेन भासमानं वस्तु द्वितीयविशेषणस्य वैशिष्ट्यप्रतीतिकाले धर्मिता-अवच्छेदक-रूपेण भासते । विशेषणतावच्छेदकधर्मस्य प्रतीतौ धर्मिणि अवश्यमेव कस्यचित् धर्मस्य धर्मितावच्छेदकरूपेण प्रतीतिरपेक्षिता इत्यपि नियमो नास्ति । अतोऽज्ञानस्य विशिष्टवैशिष्ट्यावगाहिप्रत्यक्षे विशेषणता-अवच्छेदक-प्रकारक-निश्चयस्य-अपेक्षा नास्ति ।

Crux of VVAJ section

The crux of the VVAJ section is this. Advaita Siddhi holds that VAPJ does not have any kAraNatA towards VVAJ as there is no pramANa therefor. क्लृप्त-कार्य-कारण-भाव is enough to explain the perception of VVAJ. Hence, the objection is untenable.

Alternatively, even if VAPJ is accepted to have kAraNatA towards VVAJ, Advaita Siddhi states that in some cases such as that of VVAJ preceded by a doubt with respect to visheshaNatA-avachchhedaka, VVAJ is seen to arise through 'विशेष्ये विशेषणं तत्र च विशेषणान्तरम्'. Now, since VAPJ is not present, one may argue that the resultant knowledge is not VVAJ. However, since the AkAra of resultant knowledge is the same as that of VVAJ, it is logical to hold it as VVAJ. Hence, VVAJ can arise alternatively through 'विशेष्ये विशेषणं तत्र च विशेषणान्तरम्', which may be accepted to be the mechanism behind the knowledge, अहम् अज्ञः. And hence, the objection is untenable.

Here, LaghuchandrikA adds a further dimension and posits a rule that VAPJ is required only when there is a dharmitA-avachchhedaka different from visheshaNatA-avachchhedaka in visheshaNatA-avachchhedaka-vishishTa-dharmI. In case there is no additional dharmitA-avachchhedaka, there is no need of prior VAPJ and the VVAJ can result through 'विशेष्ये विशेषणं तत्र च विशेषणान्तरम्'. It may be noted that here, in this explanation by LaghuchandrikA, रक्तदण्डवान् चैत्रः is accepted to require VAPJ. However, in Advaita Siddhi, it was demonstrated through the example of preceding doubt, that VAPJ is not required even in this case of रक्तदण्डवान् चैत्रः. LaghuchandrikA explains that since the impugned VVAJ viz. ajnAna-pratyaksha has no dharmitA-avachchhedaka of visheshaNatA-avachchhedaka in visheshaNatA-avachchhedaka-vishishTa-dharmI, there is no requirement of VAPJ in production of VVAJ. And hence, the objection of the pUrvapakshI is untenable.

Thus, it is proved that there is sAkshi-pratyaksha of bhAvarUpa-ajnAna in अहम् अज्ञः.